PATENT COOPERATION TREATY						
From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY						
To: MARK J. NAHNSEN BARNES & TORNBURG			PCT			
P.O.BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY			
			(PCT Rule 43bis.1)			
			Date of mailing (day/month/year)	26 OCT 2004		
Applicant's or agent's file reference			FOR FURTHER ACTION			
923446-95343				See paragraph 2 below		
International application No.		International filing date	(day/month/year)	year) Priority date (day/month/year)		
PCT/US04/00284		06 January 2004 (06.01.		06 January 2003 (06.01.2003)		
International Patent Classific	ation (IPC)	or both national classifica	tion and IPC			
IPC(7): B01D 45/00,46/00; B05B 7/00,15/04; B01L 1/04; F24F 7/00,7/06,13/00 and US C1.: 454/187,228,234,241,253,277,350; 95/267,268,373; 118/719,300,326						
Applicant		•				
J.B.I., IP						
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:						
Box No. I Basis of the opinion						
Box No. II	Box No. II Priority					
Box No. III	Non-establi	ishment of opinion with re	gard to novelty, inve	ntive step and industrial applicability		
Box No. IV	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention					
	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
Box No. VI	Certain documents cited					
Box No. VII	Certain def	ects in the international ap	plication	EPO - DG 1		
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application 28, 10, 2004					
2. FURTHER ACTION	Į			_		
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered 10Fa written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.						
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.						
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Authorized officer						
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US			Jerry A. Lorengo	- White ild		

Telephone No. (571) 272-1700

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/00284

Box No. I Basis of this opinion					
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	<u> </u>				
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
a. type of material					
a sequence listing					
* *					
table(s) related to the sequence listing					
b. format of material					
in written format					
in computer readable form					
c. time of filing/furnishing					
contained in international application as filed.					
filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.					
4. Additional comments:					
7. Additional commicules.					
	Į.				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/00284

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule applicability; citations and explar	43 bis.1(a)(i) nations supp) with regard orting such s	to novelty, inventive step or industri tatement	ial	
1. Statement					
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-22		YES	
	Claims			 NO	
Inventive step (IS)	Claims			_YES	
	Claims	NONE		_NO	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claima	1.22		VEC	
industrial application (IA)	Claims Claims			_YES NO	
	Cianna	NONE		110	
2. Citations and explanations: Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a cross-draft spray booth for aircraft painting and stripping or an aircraft contamination booth therefor. Although the cited references to DeRegge, Baral, Milton, Kohn, Schutic et al.; and Crisp disclose various spray booth and contamination collection apparatus, none of the prior art of record specifically teaches or suggests the apparatus capable of operating on aircraft and having the particular sidewall and endwall segmentations set forth in applicant claims 1, 9 and 15. Claims 1-22 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus are capable of industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.					

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

EVIENVATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITE	PC17US04/00284				
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international applicati	on				
The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:					
The drawings are objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity und line and include hand-drawn element numbers and Figure labels.	er PCT Article 7 because: the drawings are faint of				
	•				